

REMARKS

In the Office Action dated July 13, 2005, claims 1, 3, 4, 12, 13, 15, 17, 19, 21, 22, 25, and 29-31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 over U.S. Patent No. 6,154,646 (Tran); claims 5-7, 9-11, 16, 24, 26-28, 32, 33, 35, 36, and 38 were rejected under § 103 over Tran in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,614,899 (Sollee); and claims 14, 34, 37, and 39 were rejected under § 103 over Tran in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,681,395 (Nishi).

DISQUALIFICATION OF SOLLEE AS PRIOR ART

The present application and Sollee (U.S. Patent No. 6,614,899) were, at the time the present invention was made, owned by or subject to obligation of assignment to the same person (Nortel Networks Limited). Therefore, under 35 U.S.C. § 103(c), Sollee is disqualified as prior art. Withdrawal of the § 103 rejection of the claims over Tran in view of Sollee is respectfully requested.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 AND 103

Based on the disqualification of Sollee as prior art under § 103(c), the obviousness rejection of claims 5-7, 9-11, 16, 24, 26-28, 32, 33, 35, 36, and 38 have been overcome.

Independent claim 1 was rejected as being anticipated by Tran. Applicant respectfully disagrees with this rejection. In Fig. 1 of Tran, a mobile station 10 is depicted as being coupled to an MSC/BS 15, which in turn is coupled to an HLR/SCP 18. The Office Action identified elements 33, 34 of Fig. 2 of Tran as teaching receiving one or more predetermined criteria entered by a user through a user interface of the system. Element 33 of Tran corresponds to call information that is provided to a browser 13 in the mobile station 10 in response to an alert with information message sent by the MSC/BS to the mobile station. Element 34 of Tran is a pop-up browser menu displayed by the mobile station to present call-treatment options. Neither the call information 33 nor the pop-up menu presented at 34 can be considered “one or more predetermined criteria *entered by a user through a user interface of the user system,*” as recited in claim 1.

Next, the Office Action identified the user selection 35 element of Fig. 2 of Tran as being the comparing act of claim 1. Note that claim 1 recites comparing, by the user system, information in the control message (received in the user system) against the one or more predetermined criteria (entered by a user through a user interface of the user system). In contrast, element 35 refers to a user selecting a treatment option in the pop-up browser menu on the mobile station’s display. Thus, element 35 merely refers to user selection of treatment options in a user menu – element 35 does not constitute comparing, by the user system, information in the control message against the one or more predetermined criteria.

Finally, the Office Action identified elements 19 and 21, depicted in Fig. 1 of Tran, as constituting the loading task of claim 1. Note that claim 1 recites loading a web page, *in the user system*, based on *comparison* of information in the control message with the one or more predetermined criteria. Elements 19 and 21 in Fig. 1 of Tran are elements in an HLR 18, which is not part of the mobile station 10 (considered by the Office Action as being the user system). Moreover, element 19 of Tran is an HDML server and element 20 is a service node portion. Tran, 3:54-57. There is no mention whatsoever that the HDML server 19 or the service node portion 20 of Tran loads a web page, *in the user system*, based on *comparison* of information in

the control message (which is received in the user system) with the one or more predetermined criteria (which is entered by a user through a user interface of the user system).

In view of the foregoing, it clear that Tran does not anticipate claim 1.

Independent claim 17 is similarly allowable over Tran, as Tran fails to disclose a user system that comprises a web browser, a user interface to receive a set of one or more user-defined rules, a network interface to receive a call request over a network, and a rules processing module to compare information in the call request with the set of one or more user-defined rules (received at the user interface), and to invoke the web browser based on comparing the information in the call request with the one or more user-defined rules.

Independent claim 25 is also not anticipated by Tran. Claim 25 recites an article including one or more storage media that contain instruments for controlling a user device, where the instructions when executed cause the user device to transmit a control message according to a predetermined protocol for establishing a call session over a network, provide a user interface in the user device to receive one or more predetermined user-defined rules, compare information in the control message with one or more predetermined user-defined rules, and load a web page in response to the comparing.

Independent claim 29 is allowable over Tran, which fails to disclose receiving a call request according to a first protocol, providing a user interface to receive one or more user criteria, perform a rules check of information in the call request by comparing information in the call request with the one or more user criteria, and launching a web browser based on the rules check.

Independent claim 31 is also similarly allowable over Tran since Tran fails to disclose a web browser, a network interface to transmit a call request for establishing a call session over a network, a user interface to receive user-entered rules, and a controller to compare information in the call request with the user-entered rules, and to load a web page in the web browser in response to the comparing.

Independent claim 30 is also allowable over Tran, which fails to disclose a storage device containing user-entered rules, including a first set of rules and a second set of rules, and a controller to launch a first software routine if the first set of rules is satisfied, and to launch a second software routine if the second set of rules is satisfied.

The Office Action rejected claim 30 using the same rationale applied to the other independent claims. Note that claim 30 recites different subject matter from the other claims. In particular, the Office Action failed to identify what in Tran constitutes the first and second software routines or the first and second sets of rules. In fact, a review of Tran reveals that Tran does not disclose such a controller to launch different software routines based on different sets of rules.

Dependent claims are allowable for at least the same reasons as corresponding independent claims. Also, in view of the allowability of base claims over Tran, it is respectfully submitted that the obviousness rejection of dependent claims 14, 34, 37, and 39 of Tran over Nishi has been overcome.

Allowance of all claims is respectfully requested. The Commissioner is authorized to charge any additional fees and/or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 20-1504 (NRT.0052US).

Respectfully submitted,

Date: _____

10-13-2005



Dan C. Hu
Registration No. 40,025
TROP, PRUNER & HU, P.C.
8554 Katy Freeway, Suite 100
Houston, TX 77024
Telephone: (713) 468-8880
Facsimile: (713) 468-8883